

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,367	11/03/2003	Katsumi Azusawa	03500.007695.4 1160	
5514 7590 05/07/2007 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK NY 10112			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, NHAN T	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/698,367	AZUSAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Nhan T. Tran	2622			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti- vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 No	ovember 2003.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 12-26 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 12-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 November 2003</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the order of the contraction is objected to by the Examine	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objecd drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No. <u>07/715,457</u> . red in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	<u> </u>				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date			

Application/Control Number: 10/698,367

Art Unit: 2622

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copies have been filed in parent Application No. 07/715457, filed on 6/14/1991.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/3/2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Preliminary Amendments

3. Preliminary amendments to specification and claims filed 11/3/2003 are acknowledged. Claims 1-11 have been canceled. Claims 12-26 are pending.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,367

Art Unit: 2622

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 12, 13, 23-26 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 7-12 and 19-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,169.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims 12, 13, 23-26 are encompassed by the Patent claims 4, 7-12 and 19-27. Specifically, the instant limitations of "control means for disenabling said correcting means in the case that said image pickup means is not converting the optical image into the electrical image signal and not outputting the electrical image signal" are encompassed by the Patent claim limitations of "control means for discriminating whether said recording/reproducing means performs a reproduction operation of the recorded signal, and for controlling said compensating means according to the discrimination so as to automatically inhibit a compensation operation of said compensating means during the reproduction operation regardless of a detection output of said vibration detecting means, wherein said control means turns off power of said compensating means when said recording/reproducing means is in a reproduction mode." As seen from the Patent

Art Unit: 2622

claims, a capture mode is stopped or disabled by stop converting and outputting the electrical signal from the image pickup means, and a reproduction mode is enabled to reproduce the image signal already recorded in the recording medium. It is clear that

Page 4

the correction means is disabled (inhibited from operation) during the reproduction

mode.

5. Claims 14-22 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-12 and 19-27 of U.S. Patent No.

6,014,169 in view of Sekine et al. (US 5,561,498).

The Patent claims 4-12 and 19-27 has met limitations of instant claims 14-22 except for an explicit disclosure of monitor means for displaying the electric image signal output from said image pickup as an electronic viewfinder. However, it is well recognized by Sekine that a monitor means is implemented in an image pickup apparatus for displaying real-time images output from an image sensor as an electronic viewfinder (EVF) so as to enable the user to view live images on the monitor for framing during an image capture mode (see Sekine, Fig. 1 and col. 5, lines 15-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the Patent claims and Sekine to arrive at the instant claims 14-22 so that the image pickup apparatus would be provided with an EVF for displaying live-view images to enable the user to view the images on the monitor for framing during an image capture mode.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,367

Art Unit: 2622

Conclusion

Page 5

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhan T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7371. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

%ystem, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NHAN T. TRAN Patent Examiner